



Equality Challenge Unit

Gender equality charter mark Trial awards handbook

GEM charter for women in arts, humanities and social science.

The gender equality charter recognises commitment to advancing women's careers in arts, humanities and social science academia.

The charter is owned by Equality Challenge Unit

www.ecu.ac.uk

gender@ecu.ac.uk

Gender equality charter member network

genderchartermarktrial@jiscmail.ac.uk

The gender equality charter mark (GEM) recognises commitment to advancing women's academic careers in the arts, humanities and social sciences. In addition it covers professional and support staff, transgender equality and the underrepresentation of men in certain academic disciplines.

The charter mark utilises the experience and methodology of the Athena SWAN Charter for women in science, technology, engineering, maths and medicine (www.athenaswan.org.uk). Equality Challenge Unit manages both Athena SWAN and GEM. The Athena SWAN Charter will continue to operate as it currently stands, with a view to bringing it together with GEM in the future.

This handbook has been put together to provide a comprehensive reference point for any institution or department looking to submit a GEM award application. It should be used in conjunction with past successful award applications. If you have any further queries, please check the FAQs on the website www.ecu.ac.uk/our-projects/gender-charter-mark-1. Alternatively, please contact gender@ecu.ac.uk.

Contents

Gender equality charter mark principles.....	4
Institutional and departmental submissions:.....	4
Institution level submission only.....	4
The trial process.....	5
Key dates.....	5
Feedback.....	5
Self-assessment teams.....	6
Submission templates.....	7
Completing the data template.....	7
Completing the analysis and action planning template.....	8
Providing evidence of initiatives for trans staff.....	9
Action plans.....	9
Letter of endorsement.....	11
Web links.....	12
Word limits and appendices.....	12
Case studies.....	13
The judging process.....	14
Communication.....	14
Senior or high-level commitment.....	14
Effective analysis of the data.....	14
Evidence of sustained cultural and organisational change.....	14
Self-reflection and honesty.....	15
Engagement.....	15
Institutional award criteria.....	16
Bronze institutional award.....	16
Silver institutional award.....	16
Gold institutional award.....	17
Departmental award criteria.....	18
Bronze department award.....	18
Silver department award.....	18
Gold department award.....	19
Submitting an application.....	20
Award validity.....	21
Terminology.....	22
What is meant by a department?.....	22
Data template definitions: staff.....	23
Data template definitions: students.....	25

Gender equality charter mark principles

The submissions process is designed to ensure institutions and departments can demonstrate how they meet each of the GEM principles. Institutional submissions will need to focus on both academic and professional and support staff. Departmental submissions will need to focus on academic staff only.

Institutional and departmental submissions:

- A to address gender inequalities, commitment and action at all levels of the organisation is required
- B the absence of diversity at management and policy-making levels has broad implications which the organisation will examine
- C that employment policies, practices and procedures should actively promote gender equality
- D there are personal and structural obstacles to making the transition from undergraduate level to PhD and then into senior academic positions and managerial levels, which require the active consideration of the organisation
- E to tackle unequal representation of women or men requires changing cultures and attitudes (within the department) and across the organisation
- F the system of short-term contracts has particularly negative consequences for the retention and progression of female academics
- G a broad range of work activity undertaken by staff is recognised in their career progression and promotion

Institution level submission only

- H to tackle the unfair treatment often experienced by trans people requires changing cultures and attitudes across the organisation

The trial process

For participating institutions and departments, the trial runs from September 2013 until 31 August 2014.

Key dates

September/October 2013	Workshops
October 2013 to April 2014	HEIs and departments complete their submission templates. HEIs should build in time to provide feedback to ECU on the application process.
14 March 2014	HEIs confirm whether they will be making a submission to the panel
30 April 2014	Submission deadline
May – June 2014	Panels convene
July – August 2014	Feedback to institutions
October 2014	Launch of the gender equality charter mark

Feedback

ECU is keen to receive ongoing feedback throughout the process to ensure we are responsive to any difficulties, omissions or oversights in process. On the basis of feedback received, amendments may be made to the GEM before its launch in October 2014.

Self-assessment teams

The first stage of making an application to GEM is forming a self-assessment team. Having an effective self-assessment team will be key to the success or failure of an application to the charter mark.

Panels are keen to see a diverse membership of the self-assessment team. It should cover different **levels of the department or institution** (and, for an institution-only award, all areas of arts, humanities and social sciences). It is important to **balance administrative and human resources input with academics and professional service staff**. The submission requires a large component of reflective analysis, and this should be driven as far as possible by the full team rather than a reliance on individuals with particular knowledge or expertise in gender equality. Moreover, the team should **include men and women**.

In addition to this, where possible the cumulative experience of the self-assessment team should include:

- = balancing home responsibilities and work (particularly part-time/flexible working/career breaks)
- = dual career families (the partner does not have to be from a humanities, social science or arts background)
- = recent experience of the institution or department's recruitment and promotion processes
- = different stages of the career ladder (particularly at the early- and mid-career stages)
- = departmental and institutional management responsibilities
- = senior management

A self-assessment team can be a committee in its own right or it can operate under the umbrella of another group. Where a self assessment team operates under the umbrella of another group it must follow the GEM self assessment process.

The assessment panel expects to see evidence of a rigorous and thorough process, including regular meetings (at least three over the course of the trial) and varied methods of data collection (both qualitative and quantitative).

HEIs can be hierarchical. ECU expects a broad range of staff to be represented on the self-assessment team. Everyone on the self-assessment team should feel able to contribute and have their contributions equally valued whatever their role within the institution.

Submission templates

ECU has devised templates to enable institutions and departments demonstrate how they meet each of the GEM principles. Each departmental or institutional submission will be required to submit two templates:

- = the relevant **data template** (institutional or departmental)
- = the **analysis and action planning template** (institutional or departmental)

Completing the data template

The data template has fixed criteria (applicants only need to input data into each highlighted field) and once data has been inserted the template self-generates statistics, tables and graphs.

Applicants are required to provide data covering **a three-year period** wherever requested. Where data is unavailable or incomplete, please provide an explanation in the analysis and action planning template. In most cases this should include a relevant action to ensure its inclusion in future submissions or renewals.

The data requested is in line with Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) returns and an explanation of terminology is included in this handbook. ECU will make spot checks on submitted data templates to ensure that the data is in line with that supplied to HESA.

Identifying issues for professional and support staff

Institutional level submissions are required to present and analyse data on both professional and support staff and academic staff. Departmental level submissions need only present data on academic staff.

ECU recognises that the career paths of professional and support staff are likely to be different to academic staff. The principles of GEM have not previously been applied to professional and support staff and have been extended to cover them on the basis of feedback from the sector. While the career paths of professional and support staff may be different to the career paths of academics, the gender issues that arise are not likely to be different. **During the trial, we would particularly welcome feedback in relation to the applicability of the process and principles for professional and support staff.**

Cultural analysis tool

The former UK Resource Centre for Women in Science (UKRC) developed a cultural analysis tool. This tool was used by participating departments in the University of Reading pilot (which applied the SWAN principles to arts, humanities and social sciences). The report from the pilot stated that

participants found the cultural analysis tool to be of great value. As part of this trial table 19 of the departmental data template requires data from the UKRC tool. It can be accessed at www.hr.qmul.ac.uk/equality/athenaswancharter.

Completing the analysis and action planning template

Analysing and reflecting on what the data template shows will be the starting point for the self-assessment team to understand the current position of the department/institution. The analysis and action planning template allows the self-assessment team to describe the position of the institution/department in relation to gender equality and complete an action template to outline future work linked to what the evidence shows.

While institutions/departments will be required to submit their data template, they are not required to include all of the data in the analysis and action template. Charts and tables that are pertinent and relevant to the analyses can be copied and pasted into the analysis and action planning template. To do this, the data template will need to be unlocked using the password: trialGEM

Providing evidence of good practice

Evidence of good practice should be included in the analysis and action planning template. GEM primarily focuses on recognising initiatives and actions taken to address the underrepresentation of women in the arts, humanities and social sciences, and to support and encourage their career progression. Accordingly, evidence should cover initiatives that are in place or planned to ensure women staff working in both academic and professional and support roles are actively considered in promotion and retention processes. Government initiatives aimed at enabling men to become more involved in family life, such as additional paternity leave, also aim to reduce the impact of having a family or being perceived to want a family, on women's careers. Consequently, panels expect to see some evidence of gender-specific measures.

GEM also recognises work institutions and departments have identified to address the underrepresentation of men in specific academic disciplines at certain levels. The trial will focus on **men in teaching** and **social work**. However, if data analysis highlights issues that negatively impact on men's career progression in areas where they are underrepresented at a senior level, evidence of good practice can be included in both department and institutional submissions.

There is no prescriptive list of measures that assessment panels expect to see in place at every institution or department, but failure to recognise issues fundamental to career progression will be looked upon negatively. For more information, please consult the Athena SWAN good practice case studies (www.athenaswan.org.uk/content/good-practice) and Athena SWAN factsheets (www.athenaswan.org.uk/content/factsheets). Where

measures are cited, ensure that policies are explained in sufficient detail rather than just stated as a title. **Submissions should avoid presenting legal compliance as good practice.**

Example

Keeping in touch (KIT) days are a provision of the Work and Families Act 2006. Using KIT days has to be agreed between the employer and employee but simply allowing staff to use KIT days would not be considered good practice.

How KIT days are used may be considered good practice. For instance, how an agreement is reached between a member of staff and their employer on their use. Is use of KIT days planned in relation to career development or important networking? What support is provided to enable employees to use their KIT days?

At **silver** and **gold** levels, assessment panels are particularly keen to see examples of innovative and inventive practice.

Providing evidence of initiatives for trans staff

ECU recognises that many institutions are only just establishing policies and procedures to ensure fair treatment in relation to the provisions of the Equality Act. ECU also recognises that not all institutions collect data on trans staff and does not advise collecting this data unless the environment is appropriate. For more information on this please see information from ECU here: www.ecu.ac.uk/your-questions/monitor-gender-identity

Submissions for institutional awards will need to outline policy and practice (or at a minimum future actions) to tackle the unfair treatment often experienced by transgendered staff. It is recommended that institutions familiarise themselves with ECU's guidance: *Trans staff and students in higher education: revised 2010* (www.ecu.ac.uk/publications/trans-staff-and-students-in-he-revised).

ECU requests that institutions do not include individual names or information that may enable the identification of trans staff in their submission. It is for this reason that analyses is required at the institutional level only.

Action plans

Action plans are crucial to a submission's success. A poor action plan can cause even the best submissions to fail. To enable transparency and consistency for applicants and panel members ECU requires institutions and departments to use the pro forma found in the analysis and action planning template and copied below.

Principle	Objective	Rationale i.e. what evidence is there that prompted this objective?	Action already taken to date and outcome	Further action planned	Timeframe		Person responsible Include job title	Target outcome Where possible include a tangible measure of success	Comments
D 1	Example: To improve the maternity return rate across the department	Department statistics show a 20% return rate of women at research level posts after a period of maternity (this compares to a 90% return rate across the institution as a whole)	<p>Survey to identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> = staff understanding of maternity package = support provided during and on return from maternity leave = barriers to return (sent to staff who have returned from leave) <p>Survey found:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> = lack of understanding of the maternity policy and support available = that staff did not find keeping in touch days useful = that a number of flexible working requests had been declined 	<p>To review how keeping in touch days are used</p> <p>To explore why flexible working requests have been declined and to work with Head of HR to ensure department is exemplar for flexible working within the institution.</p>	Sept 2012	Sept 2015	Head of department working with head of HR	90% maternity return rate in the department	Update Sept 2013: Currently the statistic is at 80% after new measures put in place

			<p><i>All staff have been re-sent maternity policy and line managers have been briefed on the policy and how they can support staff prior to, during and on their return from maternity leave.</i></p>							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

It is important that the action plan is created in response to the evidence gathered by the institution or department. Panels will expect to see a clear trajectory from the evidence through to the objective and, where possible, measurable targets. In additional self-assessment teams should note the following.

- = All actions highlighted in the analysis should be numbered and referenced in the action plan against the appropriate principle.
- = Make sure you have a clear rationale – why are you doing this? Use the *rationale* column to succinctly identify what the problem is.
- = It is important to indicate how you will measure the success of an action. This should take the form of the target outcome column in the table.
- = Responsibility for completing actions should be evenly distributed; action plans where human resources and equality and diversity practitioners are responsible for everything are not well received.
- = Action plans should be aspirational and innovative, particularly at higher levels of award.
- = For departmental plans, is there an external body aligned to subject area focus from which advice can be sought?
- = Are you confident that the action plan fits with the institutional or departmental culture?
- = There is no right or wrong number of actions. However, it is important to balance conciseness with a good level of detail.
- = The panel expects to see evidence of prioritisation. Actions should be scheduled across the three year validity of the award and may be ordered by priority level rather than chronologically or thematically, or through clear start and finish times.
- = Action plans are organic documents, which is to say they should be constantly reviewed and updated (not just prepared as part of an award submission).
- = Where awards are being renewed or upgraded, a copy of the previous action plan should be included, with indications of progress made. When awards are renewed or upgraded, panels do not expect to see every single action completed by the deadlines set out in the plan. However, they do expect to see evidence of progress responsive to the needs of the department or institution.
- = Completed actions or measures already in place should be omitted from the action plan.

Letter of endorsement

To meet principle A of the charter at bronze level (for institutional and departmental awards)

‘addressing gender inequalities requires commitment and action at all levels of the institution’

a letter of endorsement from a vice-chancellor or head of department is required. It is important that the letter resonates with the panel as it sets the tone for the entire application.

The following things should be considered:

- = Above all, it goes without saying that the letter should be written by the vice-chancellor or head of department, not just signed off. Although the vice-chancellor or head of department may well wish to refer to an institution’s history and achievements, this should not be the focus of the letter.
- = Panels are keen to get a sense of individual commitment to gender equality at the top of the organisation, so it is good to draw on personal experience.
- = The letter should be addressed to ECU’s senior policy advisers for gender equality (Amy Felsing and Ellen Pugh). Contact details can be found at www.ecu.ac.uk/contact-us .
- = The letter should explain why the department or institution values GEM, and how the action plan will help meet relevant strategic aims.
- = If it is a renewal, reference should be made to the impact of the previous award.
- = For **silver** and **gold** awards, the panel will expect to hear how the department or institution has championed gender equality in arts, humanities and social sciences. The letter needs to demonstrate what actions have been made (at not less than senior management team level) to support the gender equality charter.

In addition to the above, for **silver** and **gold** applications, the letter should also include:

- = Details of tangible actions taken by the vice-chancellor, senior management team to support and promote the charter (institutional applications).
- = Details of evidence of actions taken by head of department to support and promote the charter (departmental applications).

Web links

Assessment panellists will only be able to consider information contained *within* the submission documents. This means that information in web links will not be considered.

Word limits and appendices

Words limits help ensure that submissions are of a readable length for panellists, taking into account that each panel may assess six submissions. Word limits are final.

Award type	Word limit
Bronze institution	7,500
Silver institution	7,500
Bronze department	9,000
Silver department	10,000
Gold department	10,500

Similarly, appendices, other than the action plan and letter of endorsement, are not permitted. Any supplementary appendices will be removed from submissions and will not be considered by the assessment panels.

The only exception to the stated word limits applies to applications from large colleges or faculties. Sometimes these organisational units have a broad range of arts and humanities discipline areas within them none of which hold decision making autonomy in their own right (and as such the college or faculty would meet the definition of a departmental application – see terminology section below). Such colleges or faculties should seek advice from gender@ecu.ac.uk before applying for an award to confirm if a submission would be appropriate and request a further 1000 word allowance. Where agreed, these words should be used to demonstrate how the GEM principles are embedded in each constituent unit, and, in the case of silver award submissions, show impact in them.

Case studies

Two case studies are required for silver departmental submissions. These provide an opportunity to focus on the career progression of two individuals working in the department, and should show how the inclusive culture and working practices of the department have enabled these staff to pursue a career in an arts, humanities and social science subject area.

One of these case studies should be a member of the self-assessment team, and the other should be someone else in the department. No more than two case studies should be put forward, even if within the word limit.

The judging process

Every application to GEM will be judged by an assessment panel. The panel will be made up of equality and diversity experts (including at least one with expertise of the Athena SWAN Charter), academics drawn from the arts, humanities and social sciences and may include a trade union representative. The panel will determine whether a submission meets the standard required for a bronze award (institutional submissions) or a bronze, silver or gold award (for departmental submissions).

As well as the particular requirements at each level of award (see pages 16-19), panels make judgments on the following points at every level of award.

Communication

- = Are departmental and/or institutional policies and plans actively and effectively communicated to staff?

Senior or high-level commitment

- = Has there been demonstrable input, investment, involvement/commitment and support from academic and professional and support staff with a range of seniority? This includes, for example, senior management, heads of departments, senior academics, research team leaders (male and female) and women research staff and a broad range of professional and support staff.

Effective analysis of the data

- = How successful have previous actions been? How has this success been measured and evaluated? How have these actions benefited the institution/department and the individual women and men who work in it?
- = How clearly has the evidence been presented? Is there suitable reflection and insight gained from the data?
- = Are there clear links between the evidence base and the action plan, which inform the rationale?
- = How effectively have the data, evaluation and action plan been linked?
- = Has the self-assessment team effectively evaluated and reflected upon the data?
- = Have key issues been identified and actions developed to counter any negative effects?
- = Is the data used to form tangible actions which can be measured and evaluated?

- = Have the activities, programmes, and changes successfully addressed perceptions and expectations that shape or constrain career choices and outcomes?

Evidence of sustained cultural and organisational change

- = How do planned work and initiatives link to the organisation's strategic mission and goals?
- = How significant are any changes, programmes or initiatives in terms of their anticipated outcomes, their sustainability and the likely longer term impact on the institution, its processes and its culture?
- = How well has an understanding of the institutional context/local circumstances and what the key issues are been demonstrated?
- = How far has the value of what has been done been recognised, welcomed, and valued by staff and by managers?
- = How well does the submission demonstrate an institutional 'fit', sustainability and ease with which the change has been or is likely to become embedded in the institutional/departmental culture?

Self-reflection and honesty

- = How well have problems been identified and openly recognised? Have suitable steps been taken to address them?
- = How different, innovative or particularly challenging are the actions and initiatives proposed?

Engagement

- = Have a broad range of staff been involved in the development, implementation and evaluation of policies?

Institutional award criteria

Bronze institutional award

Pre-requisites

The applicant institution must be a member of the GEM trial.

What needs to be demonstrated

A bronze institutional award recognises that the institution has a solid foundation for eliminating gender bias and developing an inclusive culture that values all staff. This includes:

- = an assessment of where the institution is in quantitative (staff and student data) and qualitative (policies, practices, systems and arrangements) terms, which has identified both challenges and opportunities
- = a plan that builds on the assessment, the activities that are already in place and what has been learned from these
- = a self-assessment team to carry proposed actions forward

Potential outcomes

- = Bronze institutional award
- = No award

Silver institutional award

Pre-requisites

The institution must hold a valid Athena SWAN or GEM bronze award.

A majority of the institution's arts, humanities and social science departments (not including faculties, colleges, or any other groupings of departments) must hold department awards.

What needs to be demonstrated

A silver institutional award recognises a significant record of activity and achievement by the institution in promoting gender equality and in addressing challenges across the full range of non-SET departments within the institution. Applications should demonstrate GEM is well embedded within the institution with strong leadership in promoting the charter principles, and evidence the impact of GEM activities.

Renewals

In addition to the above, a renewal submission should provide evidence of progress and impact of the original silver institution award application and action plan.

Potential outcomes

- = Silver institutional award
- = Bronze institutional award
- = No award

Gold institutional award

The criteria for this are currently being considered. Institutions applying to GEM will be unable to apply for a gold award during the trial phase.

Departmental award criteria

Bronze department award

Pre-requisites

The institution to which the applicant department belongs must hold a valid bronze institutional Athena SWAN or GEM award.

What needs to be demonstrated

Bronze department awards recognise that in addition to institution-wide policies, the department has identified particular challenges and is planning activities for the future. This includes:

- = an assessment of where the department is in quantitative (staff and student data) and qualitative (policies, practices, systems and arrangements) terms, which has identified both challenges and opportunities
- = a plan that builds on the assessment, the activities that are already in place and what has been learned from these
- = a self-assessment team to carry proposed actions forward

Renewals

In addition to the above, a renewal submission should provide evidence of progress made against the original bronze department award application and action plan.

Potential outcomes

- = Bronze department award
- = No award

Silver department award

Pre-requisites

The institution to which the applicant department belongs must hold a valid bronze or silver institutional Athena SWAN or GEM award.

What needs to be demonstrated

In addition to the future planning required for bronze department recognition, a silver department awards recognises that the department has taken action in response to challenges previously identified (within or without the GEM process) and can demonstrate the impact of the actions implemented.

Renewals

In addition to the above, silver department renewal submissions must show evidence that clear progress has been made against the original silver department application and action plan.

Potential outcomes

- = Silver department award
- = Bronze department award
- = No award

Gold department award

Pre-requisites

The applicant department must hold a silver department award.

What needs to be demonstrated

A gold department award recognises sustained progression and achievement by the department in promoting gender equality and to address challenges particular to the discipline. A well-established record of activity and achievement in working towards equality in the career progression in the arts humanities and social sciences should be complemented by data demonstrating continued impact in all areas. Gold departments should be beacons of achievement in gender equality and should champion and promote good practice to the wider community.

Renewals

In addition to the above, a gold department renewal award should evidence consistent progress and impact against the initial gold department application and action plan.

Potential outcomes

- = Gold department award
- = Silver department award
- = No award

Submitting an application

All applications must be made using the templates provided. Completed applications should be sent by email to gender@ecu.ac.uk by midday on 30 April 2014.

This should include:

- = a copy of the original letter of endorsement from the head of institution or department
- = the departmental or institutional data template
- = the departmental or institutional analysis and action planning template
- = for a renewal submissions, the previous updated action plan

ECU will provide information on how to submit documents in early 2014 e.g. number of copies.

Although the ECU gender team are happy to field questions at any time, please be aware that we will be extremely busy in the days running up to the deadline and will respond to queries within five working days.

Panels sometimes request supplementary information before making a decision on a submission. Submitting departments and institutions should be prepared for such requests, which, in the case of the trial will be made one or two months after the passing of the deadline.

It is expected that institutions and departments that receive awards will publish their submission form on their website. However, any personal or confidential information will need to be removed by the department or institution prior to publication – this includes details in the case studies which staff members may not want to be made public.

Award validity

All awards made are valid for three years from the submission deadline ie a successful award from April 2014 round will be valid until April 2017.

Terminology

What is meant by a department?

ECU recognises that institutions operate a range of academic and management structures, and may not all use the term 'department'. There are many academic groupings with different names, sizes and compositions. Ultimately, your institution will need to decide the composition of units to submit to GEM. However, below are some areas for consideration when making an application.

Size

Size alone does not preclude a unit from submitting (that is to say there are no minimum or maximum limits), but the departments should bear the following in mind.

- = Assessment panels expect data from all the constituent units in a large department, not averages.
- = Large departments need to clearly demonstrate good practice (and impact) across all units, and issues specific to different subject areas should be identified.
- = Communication of the GEM principles needs to be apparent across the department; it should not be driven by one single unit within.
- = Small departments need to be able to demonstrate sufficient autonomy to implement change. Sometimes such departments may have to fall within a college or faculty departmental application if they do not have decision making autonomy in their own right (see also section on word limits on page 12)
- = All departments need to find suitable comparators for benchmarking.
- = Departments are subject to the same word limits, with the exception of very large departments (see page 12 for more information)

Management structures

The head of department should have overall responsibility for resource allocation, budgets, academic strategy, and policy in the department, so as to be able to effect the changes set out in the action plan.

Students

Where a department has its own students (undergraduate and/or postgraduate), this data should be provided. A unit may still apply if it does not provide teaching, but this should be noted, and national student figures for that subject area should be considered in the application as this will impact on the pipeline in that area.

If in doubt, contact the GEM charter leads (gender@ecu.ac.uk) no later than two months in advance of the submission.

Data template definitions: staff

Academic staff

Academic staff are defined as those staff responsible for planning, directing and undertaking academic research and teaching within higher education institutions. This category may also include vice-chancellors, principals, and clinical and healthcare professionals who undertake teaching or research activities.

Professional and support staff

Those who do not have an academic employment function, such as managers, non-academic professionals, student welfare workers, cleaners, caterers and secretaries

Atypical staff

Those whose contracts involve working arrangements that are not permanent, involve complex employment relationships and/or involve work away from the supervision of the normal work provider.

Departments (arts, humanities and social sciences)

This template uses generic classification of academic departments from the HESA staff record. Departments classified as non-SET (science, engineering and technology) in this report are:

- = business and management studies
- = catering and hospitality management
- = central administration and services
- = continuing education
- = design and creative arts
- = education
- = health and community studies
- = humanities and language-based studies
- = media studies
- = modern languages
- = premises
- = residences and catering
- = social studies
- = sports science and leisure studies

- = staff and student facilities
- = total academic services

Departments (SET)

This template uses generic classification of academic departments from the HESA staff record. Departments classified as science, engineering and technology (SET) in this report are:

- = agriculture and forestry
- = anatomy and physiology
- = archaeology
- = architecture, built environment and planning
- = biosciences
- = chemical engineering
- = chemistry
- = civil engineering
- = clinical dentistry
- = clinical medicine
- = earth, marine and environmental sciences
- = electrical, electronic and computer engineering
- = general engineering
- = geography (may be covered by GEM where there is a mix of physical, social and human geography)
- = IT and systems sciences, computer software engineering
- = mathematics
- = mechanical, aero and production engineering
- = mineral, metallurgy and materials engineering
- = nursing and paramedical studies
- = pharmacy and pharmacology
- = physics
- = psychology and behavioural sciences
- = veterinary science

Atypical staff

Data should not be included on atypical staff in the data template. However, institutions may want to highlight how their organisational culture and practices extend to atypical staff.

Fixed-term contract staff

Fixed-term contract staff are those employed for a fixed period or who have an end date on their contract of employment. This includes staff on rolling fixed-term contracts.

Permanent staff

Those who are employed on a contract of employment that states the member of staff as permanent or on an open-ended contract. This includes term time-only staff who are employed on an open-ended contract.

Full person equivalent

Individuals can hold more than one contract within an institution and each contract may involve more than one activity. Staff counts have been divided among their activities in proportion to the declared full-time equivalent for each activity. This results in counts of full person equivalents (FPE). Staff FPE counts are calculated on the basis of contract activities that were active on 1 December of the reporting period.

Senior management post holder

This field indicates whether the member of staff also has senior management/administrative responsibilities within the institution associated with this contract.

For example, senior management post holders would include pro-vice-chancellor, deputy vice-chancellor, assistant principal, assistant director, dean, head of school, examinations manager, registrar or head of administration. Acting directors should be included in this field, if they hold senior management/administrative responsibilities.

Maternity return rate

Maternity return rate refers to staff who have returned to work from maternity leave. Where staff return but leave after the required contractual time to keep their contractual maternity pay, this should be listed as a non-return.

Promotion

This refers to academic promotions processes or instances where staff have been promoted without an internal or external recruitment process.

Recruitment

This refers to processes where by staff are recruited through an external or internal process.

Staff contract levels

This refers to the UCEA/XpertHR contract level framework. Starting from 2012/13, institutions are required to return this data to HESA as part of the staff record. To facilitate analysis, we ask that you group UCEA levels 2-5 into the following aggregated categories.

HESA code	UCEA/XpertHR description	Gender charter mark grouping
A0	Vice-Chancellor/ Principal/Head of Institution	VC or equivalent
B1	UCEA level 2A	UCEA level 2A and 2B
B2	UCEA level 2B	
C1	UCEA level 3A	UCEA level 3A and 3B
C2	UCEA level 3B	
D1	UCEA level 3/4A1	UCEA level 3/4A1, A2 and A3
D2	UCEA level 3/4A2	
D3	UCEA level 3/4A3	
E1	UCEA level 4A	UCEA level 4A and 4B
E2	UCEA level 4B	
F1	UCEA level 5A	UCEA level 5A and 5B
F2	UCEA level 5B	
I0	XpertHR level I	XpertHR level I
J0	XpertHR level J	XpertHR level J
K0	XpertHR level K	XpertHR level K
L0	XpertHR level L	XpertHR level L
M0	XpertHR level M	XpertHR level M
N0	XpertHR level N	XpertHR level N
O0	XpertHR level O	XpertHR level O
P0	XpertHR level P	XpertHR level P

For a

detailed description of each contract level, please refer to the guidance available from the HESA website:

www.hesa.ac.uk/component/option,com_studrec/task,show_file/itemid,233/mnl,12025/href,Combinedlevels.html

Data template definitions: students

First year student

This includes students who commenced their programme within the reporting period and is based on the HESA standard registration population. In some cases the student's first year of study may be the second or subsequent year of a programme.

Full-time student

Full-time students are those normally required to attend an institution for periods amounting to at least 24 weeks within the year of study, on sandwich courses, and those on a study-related year out of their institution. During that time, students are normally expected to undertake periods of study, tuition or work experience that amount to an average of at least 21 hours per week.

Part-time student

Part-time students are those recorded as studying part-time, or studying full-time on courses lasting less than 24 weeks, on block release, or studying during the evenings only.

Postgraduate students

Postgraduate students are defined as those on courses leading to higher degrees, diplomas and certificates. In the majority of the analysis this group has been further disaggregated into postgraduate research and postgraduate taught.

Undergraduate students

Undergraduates are students participating in undergraduate programmes of study aiming for qualifications at level of study of first degree, foundation degree or a range of higher education diplomas and certificates (levels 4–6 of the National Qualifications Framework). In the majority of the analysis, undergraduates have been disaggregated into first degree undergraduates and 'other undergraduate' students.

Other undergraduate

Includes qualification aims equivalent to and below first degree level, including, but not limited to, Professional Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) at level H (unless shown separately), foundation degrees (unless shown separately), diplomas in higher education (including those with eligibility to register to practice with a health or social care or veterinary statutory regulatory body), Higher National Diploma (HND), Higher National Certificate (HNC), Diploma of Higher Education (DipHE), Certificate of Higher Education (CertHE), foundation courses at higher education level, National Vocational Qualification (NVQ)/Scottish Vocational Qualification (SVQ) at NQF levels 4 and 5, post-degree diplomas and certificates at undergraduate level (including those in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector), professional qualifications at undergraduate level, other undergraduate diplomas and certificates including post-registration health and social care courses, other formal higher education qualifications of less than degree standard, institutional undergraduate credit and non-formal undergraduate qualifications.